



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/075,786

02/13/2002

John E. Holland

3781-002 (03781.0024.1)

9809

26158

7590

08/04/2009

WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC

ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING

P.O. BOX 7037

ATLANTA, GA 30357-0037

EXAMINER

MAYO III, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2831

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/04/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/075,786	Applicant(s) HOLLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner William H. Mayo III	Art Unit 2831	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-13, 27-29 and 34-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-13, 27-29, and 34-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 1 & 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Regarding claims 1 & 27, the phrase "or the like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2831

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
6. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 27-29, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrieu (Pat Num 5,300,337) in view of Holland et al (Pat Num 5,395,682, herein referred to as Holland) and Andrews (Pat Num 5,965,223, herein referred to as Andrews). Andrieu discloses a protective cover (Figs 1-4) for cables or hoses (abstract), which are capable of being used in environments, such as airports, docks, and construction site, wherein the cover (Figs 1-4) may be moved back and forth abrasive surfaces and subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20). Specifically, with respect to claim 1, Andrieu discloses a protective cover (10) comprising a sleeve (Figs 1-2, Col 3, lines 55-59) capable of surrounding a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4), wherein the sleeve has open ends (left and right ends) and including an elongated fabric sheet of a woven and single layer fabric (10) made of substantially high strength yarn (11, i.e. polyester, Col 3, lines 8-12), wherein the high strength yarn (11, i.e. polyester) is about 400 to 1000 denier (i.e. 600-2500, Col 3, lines 60-67), the fabric covering (10) has a warp and fill density of about 40 ends per inch (Col 4, lines 1-10), and wherein the sleeve is abrasion and moisture-resistant (Col 1, lines 12-20). With respect to claim 2, Andrieu discloses that the fabric (11) is formed from at least 70 percent high strength yarns (i.e. 100 % polyester). With respect to claim 8, Andrieu discloses that the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed as an elongated sheet having opposing longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges), wherein the opposed longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges) includes means (15) for releasably attaching

Art Unit: 2831

the opposed longitudinally edges together (Col 4, lines 24-31) around the length of a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 9, Andrieu discloses that the means (15) for fastening the longitudinal edges comprises hook and loop material (see 15, Col 4, lines 35-47). With respect to claim 27, Andrieu discloses an abrasion resistant cable system (Fig 4) comprising a length of material such as a cable (not numbered) wherein the cover (Figs 1-4) may be moved back and forth abrasive surfaces and subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20), and wherein the protective sleeve (10) surrounds the cable, which is formed from a fabric made of substantially high performance yarn (i.e. polyester), wherein the sleeve has open ends (left and right ends) and formed of a woven and single layer fabric (10) made of substantially high strength yarn (11, i.e. polyester, Col 3, lines 8-12), wherein the high strength yarn (11, i.e. polyester) is about 400 to 1000 denier (i.e. 600-2500, Col 3, lines 60-67), the fabric covering (10) has a warp and fill density of about 40 ends per inch (Col 4, lines 1-10), and wherein the sleeve is abrasion and moisture-resistant (Col 1, lines 12-20). With respect to claim 28, Andrieu discloses that the fabric (11) is formed from at least 70 percent high strength yarns (i.e. 100 % polyester). With respect to claim 34, Andrieu discloses that the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed as an elongated sheet having opposing longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges), wherein the opposed longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges) includes means (15) for releasably attaching the opposed longitudinally edges together (Col 4, lines 24-31) around the length of a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 35, Andrieu discloses that the

Art Unit: 2831

means (15) for fastening the longitudinal edges comprises hook and loop material (see 15, Col 4, lines 35-47).

However, Andrieu doesn't necessarily disclose the protective sleeve being made of a yarns formed of primarily of long chain polyethylene fibers having a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier, the fabric density of between about 30 and 36 inches per inch, wherein the sleeve is lightweight, and wherein the yarns themselves are resistant to deterioration from chemicals, fuels, oil, cut and tear resistant, wherein the yarns are resistant to heat build up (claims 1 & 27), nor the yarns being 70% long chain polyethylene (claims 2 & 28), nor the protective cover being made of a material fabric having a weight of between of between about 5 & 8 ounces per square yard (claims 3 & 29).

Holland teaches a protective cover, that is made of Spectra® fibers (Col 2, lines 28-37), that overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment (Col 1, lines 5-10). Specifically, with respect to claims 1 & 27, Holland teaches that the protective cover is made of high performance yarns, such as Spectra® fibers that inherently has a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier, wherein the fabric formed of Spectra® fibers are cut, tear, fuel, chemical, and oil resistance to petroleum-based products (Col 4, lines 45-51), wherein the sleeve is lightweight, and wherein the yarns themselves are resistant to deterioration from

Art Unit: 2831

chemicals, fuels, oil, cut and tear resistant, wherein the yarns are resistant to heat build up (Col 4, lines 45-51). With respect to claims 2 & 28, Holland teaches that the fabric containing 100% Spectra® fibers are 100% long chain extended polyethylene (Col 2, lines 25-30). With respect to claims 3 & 29, Holland teaches that the fabric may be constructed to have a warp and fill density of between 30 and 36 ends per inch (Col 2, lines 49-51).

With respect to claims 1-3 and 27-29, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of cables at the time the invention was made to modify the protective cover, which is made of polyester fibers, of Andrieu to comprise the Spectra® fibers and the fabric parameters of the protective fabric as taught by Holland because Holland teaches that such a fabric by made of commercially available Spectra® fibers and having the specified parameters, overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment in which the cover is used (Col 1, lines 5-10) and since it has been held to be within general skill of a worker in the art to select a commercially available or known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Modified Andrieu also doesn't necessarily disclose the protective cover consisting of yarns having a thermoplastic film selected from the group of polyethylene and ethylene vinyl acetate film bonded to at the one side or surface thereof (claims 1 & 27).

Art Unit: 2831

Andrews teaches a composite protective cover, that is cut and abrasion resistant (Col 2-3, lines 40-43 & 22-24 respectively), and may be utilized as a tube of jacketing material for tubing, hoses, and electrical wires (Col 2, lines 38-40), has minimal weight, provides greater tactile sensitivity, improved comfort, and enhanced freedom of motion (Col 4, lines 53-57). Specifically, with respect to claims 1, 6, 27, and 32, Andrew teaches that the composite protective cover comprising an inner layer (23) bonded to an second layer (25, Col 6, lines 45-52), wherein the second layer (25) provides a barrier to contaminants and moisture (Col 3, lines 47-59), wherein the inner layer (23) may be made of high performance yarns, such as Spectra® ultra high molecular weight extended chain polyethylene (Col 4, lines 15-19) and an outer layer (25) that may be polyethylene (PE) or ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA, Col 3, lines 55-59), and wherein the layers (23 & 25) are bonded to form a single protective cover consisting of yarns having a thermoplastic film selected from the group of polyethylene and ethylene vinyl acetate film bonded to at the one side or surface thereof (Col 3, lines 45-55).

With respect to claims 1 & 27, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of cables at the time the invention was made to modify the protective cover, which is made of inner layer of Spectra® fibers of modified Andrieu to comprise the composite fabric of Spectra® fibers and PE or EVA, as taught by Andrew because Andrew teaches that such a fabric by made of commercially available Spectra® fibers that are cut and abrasion resistant (Col 2-3, lines 40-43 & 22-24 respectively), and may be utilized as a tube of jacketing material for tubing, hoses, and electrical wires (Col 2, lines 38-40), has minimal weight, provides greater tactile sensitivity, improved comfort,

Art Unit: 2831

and enhanced freedom of motion (Col 4, lines 53-57), and that adding a second inner layer to the Spectra® fibers, provides the protective cover with barrier to contaminants and moisture (Col 3, lines 47-59), and since it has been held to be within general skill of a worker in the art to select a commercially available or known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

7. Claims 10-12 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrieu (Pat Num 5,300,337) in view of Holland (Pat Num 5,395,682) and Andrews (Pat Num 5,965,223), herein referred to as modified Andrieu, as applied to claims 1 and 27 above, further in view of Kite, III et al (Pat Num 4,891,256, herein referred to as Kite). Modified Andrieu discloses a protective cover (Figs 1-4) for cables or hoses (abstract), which are capable of being used in environments wherein the cover (Figs 1-4) may be subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20) as described above. Specifically, with respect to claim 10, modified Andrieu discloses a protective cover (10) comprising a sleeve (Figs 1-2, Col 3, lines 55-59) capable of surrounding a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 11, modified Andrieu discloses that the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed having opposing longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges), wherein the opposed longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges) includes means (15) for releasably attaching the opposed longitudinally edges together (Col 4, lines 24-31) around the length of a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 12, modified Andrieu discloses that the means (15) for fastening the longitudinal edges comprises hook and loop material (see 15, Col

Art Unit: 2831

4, lines 35-47). With respect to claim 36, modified Andrieu discloses a protective cover (10) comprising a sleeve (Figs 1-2, Col 3, lines 55-59) capable of surrounding a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 37, modified Andrieu discloses that the sleeve (Fig 1) is formed having opposing longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges), wherein the opposed longitudinal edges (top and bottom edges) includes means (15) for releasably attaching the opposed longitudinally edges together (Col 4, lines 24-31) around the length of a cable or hose (abstract, Fig 4). With respect to claim 38, modified Andrieu discloses that the means (15) for fastening the longitudinal edges comprises hook and loop material (see 15, Col 4, lines 35-47).

However, modified Andrieu doesn't necessarily disclose the sleeve being a plurality of bands comprising a short length of the fabric and being spaced apart along the length of the cable or hose (claims 10 & 36), nor each band having opposed longitudinally edges including means for fastening the opposed longitudinally edges together around the length of the cable (claims 11 & 37).

Kite teaches a wraparound closure device (Figs 1-4) made of a fabric that protects elongated substrates, such as cables, from abrasion (Col 1, lines 5-10). Specifically, with respect to claims 10 & 36, Kite teaches a wraparound sleeve (10-Fig 3) that may be made of polyester (Col 4, line 49-50) and is formed as a plurality of bands (see three fabric sleeves not numbered) wherein each band comprises a short length of the fabric which are spaced apart along the length of the cable (Fig 3) for the purpose of providing effective bundling device that accommodates multiple cable break-outs (Col 1, lines 38-45). With respect to claims 11 & 37, Kite teaches that each short

Art Unit: 2831

length of fabric (see 3 section of fabric, Fig 3) having opposed longitudinally edges (left and right sides of all three fabrics) wherein the opposed longitudinally edges has means (24, 30, & 32) for fastening the opposed longitudinally edges together around a length of the cable (Fig 3).

With respect to claims 10-11 & 36-37, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of cables at the time the invention was made to modify the polyester protective cover of modified Andrieu to comprise a multiple protective covers as taught by the Kite because Kite teaches that such a fabric configuration protects elongated articles from abrasion (Col 4, lines 5-8) and provides effective bundling device that accommodates multiple cable break-outs (Col 1, lines 38-45) and since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. (*St. Regis Paper Co v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8).

8. Claims 13 & 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrieu (Pat Num 5,300,337) in view of Holland (Pat Num 5,395,682) and Andrews (Pat Num 5,965,223), herein referred to as modified Andrieu, as applied to claims 1 and 27 above, further in view of Holt et al (Pat Num 5,070,597, herein referred to as Holt). Modified Andrieu discloses a protective cover (Figs 1-4) for cables or hoses (abstract), which are capable of being used in environments wherein the cover (Figs 1-4) may be subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20) as detailed above with reference to claims 1 & 27.

Art Unit: 2831

However, modified Andrieu doesn't necessarily disclose the protective cover further comprising a hood made of the same fabric and fastened to at least one end of the sleeve for protecting the exposed end of the cable or hose (claims 13 & 39).

Holt teaches a double wall protective cover (Figs 1-19b) comprising flame retardant, abrasion resistance, and split or tear resistance (Col 18, lines 21-26), for the purpose of providing environmental protection, including electrical protection, and joining or mechanical holding of substrates such as cables or pipes (Col 1, lines 17-21). Specifically, with respect to claims 13 & 39, Holt discloses that the protective cover (Figs 1-19b) may be formed of polyester (Col 7, line 36) and as a hood (i.e. end cap, 19, Figs 6a-d), wherein the hood (19) may be fastened to at least one end of the cable or pipe (22) for protecting the exposed end of the cable or pipe (22, Col 29, lines 23-24).

With respect to claims 13 & 39, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of cables at the time the invention was made to modify the cable or pipe assembly of modified Andrieu to comprise a end cap protective cover formed of fabric as taught by the Holt because Holt teaches that fabrics, having excellent flame retardant, abrasion resistance, and split or tear resistance (Col 18, lines 21-26), are commonly used to protect cables and pipes are sometimes formed as end cap cover configuration that provides environmental protection, including electrical protection for the joining or mechanical holding of substrates such as cables or pipes (Col 1, lines 17-21) and also provides protection for the exposed ends of cables or pipes (Col 29, lines 23-24).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed April 30, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, the applicant argues the following:

- A) The combination of Andrieu with the other secondary references has been made as a result of hindsight and not as a result of predictable combination.
- B) The examiner is piecing together references without any explanation and therefore the combination of Andrieu with Holt is improper as there would be no need to protect the ends of such cables because the end would likely seriously interfere with the operation of the connected cable.
- C) Andrieu doesn't necessarily disclose the sleeve being formed of high performance high tensile strength yarns comprising 150grams/denier, high tenacity (7grams/denier), or high density polyethylene, nor the warp and fill density being 30-36 ends/inch, nor the protective system being moisture resistant as well as resistant of chemicals and lubricants
- D) Andrews doesn't necessarily teach that the protective cover is loosely or encases cables, hoses, or the like, nor does it describe a sleeve with open ends, nor utilizing high chain polyethylene yarns having a denier of 400-1000, nor the fabric is resistant of heat build up nor if the fabric is lightweight.
- E) A proper prima facie case of obviousness has not been shown and therefore the combination of Andrieu and Andrews is improper.

Art Unit: 2831

With respect to arguments A-E, the examiner respectfully traverses as they may be applied to the newly submitted rejections. Firstly, the examiner would like to state that it is improper for the applicant to attack individual references when the rejection is based on the combined teachings of both references. Specifically, the courts have been consistent that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Secondly, the examiner recognizes that in order to establish a proper prima facie case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. Specifically, MPEP states the following:

ESTABLISHING A PRIMA FACIE CASE OF OBVIOUSNESS

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143 - § 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria.

Andrieu clearly recognizes the problem of wires and cables needing abrasion and weather protection as claimed. Specifically, Andrieu clearly discloses a protective

Art Unit: 2831

cover (Figs 1-4) for cables or hoses (abstract), which are capable of being used in environments wherein the cover (Figs 1-4), may be subject to abrasion and weather extremes (i.e. heat, Col 1, lines 12-20). While it has been admitted on the record that Andrieu doesn't necessary disclose the material being cut resistant or tear resistant, or being expensive, nor the protective cover being made of yarns having a thermoplastic film selected from the group of polyethylene and ethylene vinyl acetate film bonded to at the outer surface there, the courts have long held that the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). In this case, Holland clearly teaches a protective cover, that is made of Spectra® fibers (Col 2, lines 28-37), that overcomes the disadvantages of prior art polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment (Col 1, lines 5-10). The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Andrieu clearly teaches a protective cover for cables that may be made of polyester for protecting against weather elements (i.e. heat) and that is abrasion resistant as

Art Unit: 2831

explained above. Holland clearly teaches a protective cover that is that is made of Spectra® fibers (Col 2, lines 28-37), that overcomes the disadvantages of prior art polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), such as the cover of Andrieu, and also has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment (Col 1, lines 5-10). Andrews teaches a composite protective cover, that is cut and abrasion resistant (Col 2-3, lines 40-43 & 22-24 respectively), and may be utilized as a tube of jacketing material for tubing, hoses, and electrical wires (Col 2, lines 38-40), has minimal weight, provides greater tactile sensitivity, improved comfort, and enhanced freedom of motion (Col 4, lines 53-57), wherein the composite protective cover comprising an inner layer (23) bonded to an second layer (25, Col 6, lines 45-52), wherein the second layer (25) provides a barrier to contaminants and moisture (Col 3, lines 47-59). Clearly, Andrieu, Andrew, and Holland are concerned with the protective covers providing abrasion and weather resistant as disclose above in the rejection. While Holland, states that the protective cover may be used with cargo container, Holland clearly teaches that the protective cover can also be utilized in other applications, where the protection of interior components by a cover having the properties of abrasion and weather resistance is needed (see Col 3, lines 18-24). Clearly as taught by Holland, a protective cover made of Spectra fibers not only fulfils the stated purposes of Andrieu (i.e. abrasion and weather resistant) but also teaches why such a protective cover is more superior that protective covers made of polyester materials, such as the protective cover of Andrieu. Therefore, there clearly does exist a motivation to modify the polyester protective cover of Andrieu to comprise

Art Unit: 2831

the Spectra® fibers and the fabric parameters of the protective fabric as taught by Holland because Holland teaches that such a fabric by made of commercially available Spectra® fibers and having the specified parameters, overcomes the disadvantages of polyester fabric covers (Col 2, lines 16-23), such as the polyester protective cover of Andrieu, and has minimal weight, increased abrasion resistance, tear strength, cut and stab resistance, and is compatible with the environment in which the cover is used (Col 1, lines 5-10).

Andrews also teaches a composite protective cover, that is cut and abrasion resistant (Col 2-3, lines 40-43 & 22-24 respectively), and may be utilized as a tube of jacketing material for tubing, hoses, and electrical wires (Col 2, lines 38-40), has minimal weight, provides greater tactile sensitivity, improved comfort, and enhanced freedom of motion (Col 4, lines 53-57), wherein the composite protective cover comprising an inner layer (13) bonded to an outer layer (11, Col 5, lines 45-52), wherein the inner layer (13) may be made of high performance yarns, such as Spectra® ultra high molecular weight extended chain polyethylene (Col 4, lines 15-19) and an outer layer (11) that may be polyethylene (PE) or ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA, Col 3, lines 55-59) that inherently has a tensile modulus equal to or greater than 150g/denier and a tenacity equal to or greater than 7 grams/denier(i.e. the applicant has disclosed that Spectra® ultra high molecular weight extended chain polyethylene is a material having such characteristics). While Andrews discloses that the protective cover is utilized in apparel such as gloves, Andrews also states that the composite fabric may be utilized as a tubular articles such as jacketing for tubing, hoses, and electrical wiring (Col 2,

Art Unit: 2831

lines 38-40). Clearly as taught by Andrew, a protective cover made of laminated Spectra, that is cut and abrasion resistant (Col 2-3, lines 40-43 & 22-24 respectively), and may be utilized as a tube of jacketing material for tubing, hoses, and electrical wires (Col 2, lines 38-40), has minimal weight, provides greater tactile sensitivity, improved comfort, and enhanced freedom of motion (Col 4, lines 53-57), wherein the protective cover comprising an inner layer (23) bonded to an second layer (25, Col 6, lines 45-52), wherein the second layer (25) provides a barrier to contaminants and moisture (Col 3, lines 47-59), wherein the inner layer (23) may be made of high performance yarns, such as Spectra® ultra high molecular weight extended chain polyethylene (Col 4, lines 15-19) and an outer layer (25) that may be polyethylene (PE) or ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA, Col 3, lines 55-59) is clearly in line with the objectives of Andrieu (i.e. abrasion and weather resistant). Therefore, there clearly exist a motivation to modify the protective cover, which is made of inner layer of Spectra® fibers of modified Andrieu to comprise the composite fabric of Spectra® fibers and PE or EVA, as taught by Andrew because Andrew teaches that such a fabric by made of commercially available Spectra® fibers that are cut and abrasion resistant (Col 2-3, lines 40-43 & 22-24 respectively), and may be utilized as a tube of jacketing material for tubing, hoses, and electrical wires (Col 2, lines 38-40), has minimal weight, provides greater tactile sensitivity, improved comfort, and enhanced freedom of motion (Col 4, lines 53-57), and that adding a second inner layer to the Spectra® fibers, provides the protective cover with barrier to contaminants and moisture (Col 3, lines 47-59), and since it has been held to be within general skill of a worker in the art to select a commercially available or

Art Unit: 2831

known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Based on the teachings of Holland & Andrew, it has also been held that to be within general skill of a worker in the art to select a commercially available or known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416. Secondly, there clearly exists a reasonable expectation of success, since both Holland, Andrew, and Andrieu all teach protective covers that may be utilized with hoses or electrical cables thereby providing the same properties, such as abrasion and weather protection. Thirdly, the combination of Andrieu and Holland discloses all of the claimed invention. Therefore, all three basic criteria for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness have been met.

The applicant has also made arguments geared toward a POSA (person of ordinary skill in the art). The examiner would just like to state that the board has been clear that one of ordinary skill in the art would render to claimed invention obvious (please refer to Examiner's Answers 1 & 2), both of which were affirmed. Secondly, with respect to predictability, cost, and the hindsight arguments, all of which have also been rebutted and affirmed by the Board of Patent Appeals.

In light of the above stated comments, the examiner respectfully submits that the 35 USC 103(a) is proper and just.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communication

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Mayo III whose telephone number is (571)-272-1978. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-6:00 pm (alternate Fridays off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego F.F. Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-2245 or (571) 272-2800

Art Unit: 2831

ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William H. Mayo III/

William H. Mayo III
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831

WHM III
August 2, 2009